

Apocalyptic Kingship, Harmony and Political Expediency: the Challenges and Paradoxes of Andrew Marvell's "First Anniversary"

Tomáš Jajtner

The following paper deals with the interpretation of one of the major "Cromwellian" poems of Andrew Marvell (1621–1678), "The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector", 1655. The poem is first set in the context of Marvell's poetry and his public career in the period between 1637 and 1660. The article then identifies and analyses three main themes of "The First Anniversary": the notion of a new aeon starting with Cromwell's rule and the apocalyptic imagery related to his Protectorate, the concept of his power and authority between liberty and tyranny, and the relation between the harmony established by Cromwell and classical Pythagorean harmonious lore. The author argues that the imagery Marvell uses to describe the nature of the regime (especially the concept of Cromwell's "no-kingship") shows a deeply paradoxical structure, which uncovers the frailty and insecurity of Cromwell's dictatorship as well as the circular logic of its justification. In that sense, the poem can be read as a vivid manifestation of the dilemmas and tensions of this period.

Keywords

English poetry; Andrew Marvell; imagery of Cromwellian England; concepts of kingship; concepts of harmony

Introduction

The life and work of Andrew Marvell (1621–1678) in some ways reflects the swings and dilemmas of English history in the middle of the 17th century. In his two early Latin and Greek poems ("Ad regem Carolum parodia" and "Προς Κάρολον τὸν βασιλέα"), Marvell celebrates the birth of Charles II, in the second phase of the English Civil War, he praises the courage of the Royalists (e.g., "An Elegy Upon the Death of My Lord Francis Villiers" of 1648), the "Horatian Ode" of 1650 laments the execution of the King while betraying the author's fascination with Cromwell; the "First Anniversary" presents

Cromwell as the guarantor of order and harmony in England (1655), but only five years later, Marvell accepts the Restoration, evading punishment not only for himself, but also helping to spare the life of his lifelong friend, John Milton. In 1661 he was re-elected to Parliament and his political genius restored together with the monarchy. Marvell has thus often been presented as an opportunist, who was not ashamed to use his supreme poetic gift to serve the leading faction.

His major poem dedicated to Cromwell, “The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector, 1655” has been studied from various points of view: as a document showing the interaction of poetry and politics at the time, as a meditation on the status of Cromwell in relation to the ideal of proper government (including his debated accession to the English throne) and, finally, as a poetic exposition of the perspectives of England in the new era marked by the rise of the Lord Protector. In this article, I would like to present a complex reading of the poem concentrating on the interaction of the major themes: the new aeon of Cromwellian government, the tension of power and freedom in defining the new era and the concept of harmony related to the rise of his protectorate. In this way, I want to point out the challenges as well as the striking paradoxes of the work.

Framing a new aeon: Cromwell’s kingship beyond kingship

The very name of the poem marks an important symbolical development in the course of the Commonwealth (1649-1659): the “first anniversary” of Cromwellian rule suggests a breakup with the practice of the early Commonwealth to number the years of its existence from the regicide in 1649². In that sense, Cromwell’s forcible dissolution of the Rump Parliament in April 1653 and his subsequent dominance in the persona of the Lord Protector are not mere “events” in the development of the “republic” or some sort of a “new settlement” after the regicide abolished the monarchy. Cromwellian rule in Marvell’s poem is a brand new era presenting a new type of “ruler”: a “no-king” better than all the monarchs of Europe at that time and a providential sign for the world: a Davidic king whose emergence revives the hope for the eschatological triumph of godliness.

In the beginning of the poem, the new quality of the moment is expressed in a series of images that stress the extraordinary nature of the anniversary:

Cromwellian rule emerges out of “useless time” (l. 41): “Man” gets lost in “the weak circles of increasing years” (l. 4), in which “flowing Time above his head does close” (l. 6). This unstructured chaos, full of confusing signs, is suddenly interrupted with the emergence of a “new sun” that makes time run again, (re)establishing the “day”. This “day” is marked by revelatory qualities; it is a self-explanatory sign of a new aeon:

Cromwell alone with greater vigour runs,
 (Sun-like) the stages of succeeding suns:
 And still the day which he doth next restore,
 Is the just wonder of the day before.
 Cromwell alone doth with new lustre spring,
 And shines the jewel of the yearly ring. (l. 7-12)³

The reasons for this kind of “aeon-establishing” rhetoric may be numerous: apart from rectifying the abolition of the monarchy and establishing the status of the Lord Protector as a better leader than the late king, Marvell stresses Cromwell’s “special relationship with God that recent royal leaders have not shared” (McGlamery 21). Godliness as the Lord Protector’s chief quality makes him stand out not only in the context of English political history, but also in the whole of the previous European experience.

The challenge here seems to be the awkwardness of the English position where the organic nature of the nation is no longer represented by the unity of the physical and “politic” body of the king⁴. After a series of images dealing with the “ineffective and slow” rule of kings, whose renown is false because “taken by proxy” (l. 24) and spent in useless activities and vain expectations in comparison to the Cromwell’s remarkable achievement (“Tis he the force of scattered time contracts,/And in one year the work of ages acts...” l. 13-14), Marvell puts forward his case for Cromwell’s godliness: his wonder-working abilities in the Amphion’s simile (l. 49-86), his harmonising peace-making opening the millennium when all nations are united⁵ (l. 87-158), his “happy birth” from a “saint-like” mother (l. 159-162), his life endangered in the coach accident in the Hyde Park as a consequence of people’s sins (l. 177-249) and his identification with major Old Testament figures (Gedeon/Gideon – l. 249-256, Noah – l. 283-289).

This typological reading of Cromwell’s rule yet again stresses the extraordinary grace Cromwell seems to enjoy: it is a true event in history, “useful time” joining the time of the Revelation with the present. In that

sense, it fills the present with the eschatological, revelatory qualities of the time to come, in which God's grace triumphs over the supposedly powerful stratagems of the earthly logic. Indeed, Gedeon/Gideon was the one who delivered the Israelites from the Midianite invasion with a small group of only 300 men (cf. Judges 8) and Noah's family⁶ was saved in the Flood as the only remnant of the righteous. The tension between this typological/eschatological reading and the contemporary confusion is dramatically pointed out in the last section of the poem: those kings who – like the late Charles II – claim the “divine right of kings” find it impossible to understand Cromwell's success: even though he is not a king; his victories are indisputable signs that the days of the “traditional” kings and the concept of kingship they seem to represent are effectively over:

‘Is this’, saith one, ‘the nation that we read
Spent with both wars, under a captain dead?
Yet rig a navy while we dress us late;
And ere we dine, raze and rebuild our state. (l. 349-352)

[...]

He seems a king by long succession born
And yet the same to be a king does scorn.
Abroad a king he seems, and something more,
At home a subject on the equal floor.
O could I once him with our title see,
So should I hope yet he might die as wee.
But let them write his praise that love him best,
It grieves me sore to have thus much confessed. (l. 387-394)

Marvell's argument stresses the incapacity of the kings to establish more than lines of succession, whereby pressing problems are constantly delegated onto new and new generations that will, however, fail, too. Cromwell's line of succession can logically be only *beyond the blood line*: he comes from heaven, where he learned the timeless divine harmony: “While indefatigable Cromwell hies,/And cuts his way still nearer to the skies./Learning a music in the region clear [...]” (l. 45-48) This quality of timelessness – associated with Cromwell's execution of the divine will – then enters time as something exquisitely “useful”, because otherwise the whole of mankind – as we find in

the very beginning of the poem – drowns in the “weak circles of increasing years” (l. 4).

Marvell thus arrives at an interesting paradox: on the one hand, he argues a case for a new definition of kingship, in which the old type would seem a mere dark symbol of *what is to come*. At the same time, however, this “Second Coming” seems to *have already come* in the new aeon of Cromwell’s rule in which an uncrowned king perplexes the minds of those who consciously or not actively enough confront the tyranny and perversion of the Roman monster. He is a king “beyond (earthly) kingship”, who no longer claims the “blasphemous” divine right. Nevertheless, he is endowed with a “divine right” *sui generis*, one that indicates the “usefulness” of time, or indeed, marks the beginning of a particular era, or the apocalypse itself.

The tension of this “totality” of meaning is thus necessarily, but also paradoxically reflected in the meditation on the nature of his government: the new “freedom” gained by his rule is balanced with the power he needs to employ to keep his political arrangement going.

Power and harmony: “not a freedom, nor a tyranny”

The dramatic imagery Marvell uses to stress the epic dimensions of Cromwell’s emergence clearly distinguishes the world into two conflicting parties that cannot be reconciled without the apocalyptic perspective of the poem. Just like the time of England is divided into “before and after” Cromwell, i.e. the chaos of the primeval, “useless time” and the shining “new day”, the political landscape of the Commonwealth seems to be torn apart by the confused and divisive tensions of the warring factions. The only hope for the country is thus a violent intervention that silences opponents and re-establishes the political organism of England, Scotland and Ireland. In that sense, the notion of “Cromwellian freedom” needs further clarification.

The Lord Protector had to face the centrifugal tendencies of the “stubborn men” (l. 78) of the pre-Cromwellian Commonwealth, those “tedious statesmen” who “many years did hack,/Framing a liberty that still went back” (l. 69-70). Their “tediousness” makes them impotent in the struggle with the devilish enemy of the apocalyptic whore, and they need to be woken up from their “long slumbers” (l.122). However, the ignorance of the princes is not the only problem calling for major action: it is also the numerous sects who undermine English freedom by destroying civil order and civil life, especially

the Quakers and the Fifth Monarchists⁷, “the Chammish issue” (l. 293). Their ideas of religious freedom threaten to destabilise what Marvell calls “sober liberty” (l. 289), i.e. liberty of conscience which balances the power of the state with respect for individual will. Marvell is, however, well aware of the awkward nature of this balance and admits the problematical nature of this settlement:

‘Tis not a freedom, that where all command;
Nor tyranny, where one does them withstand:
But who of both the bounders knows to lay
Him as their father must the state obey. (l. 279-282)

The inability of the “tedious statesmen” is thus connected with their inability to establish a “republic” where the loyalty to the state reaches the same level of authority as the former loyalty to the king and his “two bodies”. Cromwell’s seizing of power is, therefore, seen as the providential settling of the problem of authority in an emergent “civil society”. In other words, where no authority is granted, there reigns chaos. If, however, Cromwell is alluded to as the personalised embodiment of the republic and the one and only guarantee of “sober liberty”, then his dictatorial power seems – paradoxically – a matter of course. He is thus the “father” (l. 282) of the new settlement, a prophetic “great prince” (l. 395), whose personal charisma ultimately decides the fate of “English freedom”. He is “on the equal floor” (l. 390) with every other “free” Englishmen, yet he is to be given special veneration, because “his only soul/Moves the great bulk, and animates the whole” (l. 379-380). He represents the totality of the system and the one and only assurance that these freedoms are kept.

However, the text betrays a sense of uneasiness with this profoundly insecure arrangement. This point can clearly be shown on the discussion of the coach accident in Hyde Park (l. 177-249): the people’s longing to be free is described as a “bruttish fury struggling to be free” (l. 177) which endangered not only Cromwell’s life, but with it also the entire framework of the state. Not surprisingly, this incident also acquires epic, mythic dimensions:

Thou Cromwell falling, not a stupid tree,
Or rock so savage, but it mourned for thee:
And all about was heard a panique groan,
As if that Nature’s self were overthrown.

It seemed the earth did from the centre tear;
 It seemed the sun was fall'n out of the sphere:
 Justice obstructed lay, and reason fooled;
 Courage disheartned, and religion cooled.
 A dismal silence through the palace went,
 And then loud shrieks the vaulted marbles rent.
 Such as the dying chorus sings by turns,
 And to deaf seas, and ruthless tempests mourns,
 When now they sink, and now the plundering Streams
 Break up each deck, and rip the oaken seams. (l. 201-214)

The whole of Creation thus seems to respond to the incident whose significance “assayed to overturn us all” (l. 176). In other words, the fate of the “new” freedom in the “new” Commonwealth is eminently associated with the personal fate of Cromwell himself as *articulum stantis et cadentis rei publicae*. Without Cromwell this “freedom” would not have been established, but once he falls, the liquid “watery maze” of the opening verse may easily come back.

Unlike the kings of the past, however, the continuation of his regime is obscure, since no line of succession is presupposed⁸. Marvell’s argument for Cromwellian apocalyptic “kingship beyond kingship” thus shows another major paradox: Cromwell’s identification with the Old Testament judge Gideon as a type “against the hereditary principle” (Worden 152) can in the end “overturn” all of the achieved privileges of the “English freedom”. The victory of “godliness” under his rule might have been a providential intervention, but the fate of the regime is, ultimately, a completely different matter. In fact, Marvell obliquely re-addresses this point in his later elegy on Cromwell (“A Poem upon the Death of His Late Highness the Lord Protector”, publ. 1659). Here the *fait accompli* of the designated succession of Cromwell’s third son Richard (1626-1712) is, however, no longer an issue⁹. The apocalyptic revelation of the late Lord Protector undermining the “regal sloth” (l. 122) of the monarchs of the day now – quite surprisingly – gives way to a time-tested hereditary principle.

The repeated emphasis on power to organise the chaos and ruin of the country after years of the Civil War and the unsuccessful settlement during the early Commonwealth (i.e. the period between 1649 and 1653) is nowhere as strikingly visible as in the forcible identification of Cromwell with Amphion. A major myth about the extraordinary power of music paradoxically turns into its very opposite: about a “musical” praise on Cromwell’s power.

Cromwell as Amphion: harmony held by power¹⁰

Amphion (Ἀμφίωνας) is a character from Greek mythology, who overcame a relative lack of physical strength with an extraordinary musical gift. While his brother Zethus (Ζῆθος) was struggling to rebuild the citadel of Thebes with his own hands, Amphion played his lyre and the stones returned to their original places (Cf. Tripp 44). The allusion in “The First Anniversary” stresses both the timeless quality of Cromwell’s achievement and the disharmonious situation of England prior to his dictatorship.

Prior to this “musical” simile, Cromwell is presented as descending from heaven where he learned the music of the spheres, which is to be understood as a prerequisite for executing his quasi-divine will (l. 45-48). The chaos of the conflicting parties can now be fully resolved: a functioning “commonwealth” is re-established. Cromwell is thus portrayed as a *deus-ex-machina* restoring law and order:

So when Amphion did the lute command,
Which the god gave him, with his gentle hand,
The rougher stones, unto his measures hewed,
Danced up in order from the quarries rude;
This took a lower, that an higher place,
As he the treble altered, or the bass:
No note he struck, but a new stone was laid,
And the great work ascended while he played.
The listening structures he with wonder eyed,
And still new stops to various time applied:
Now through the strings a martial rage he throws,
And joining straight the Theban tower arose;
Then as he strokes them with a touch more sweet,
The flocking marbles in a palace meet;
But for he most the graver notes did try,
Therefore the temples reared their columns high. (l. 49-64)

The philosophical context of this passage is the dominant concept of the universe in the Renaissance, i.e., Pythagorean cosmology. In this doctrine, the idea of music penetrates the world, since music ultimately re-enacts the harmonious, proportionally organised cosmos¹¹. Classical myths about music –

that of Amphion, but perhaps most importantly that of Orpheus whose music tamed even the wild beasts¹² – wanted to reiterate the notion of the power of music to stir the passions and point to the unchangeable, harmonious ground of the universe¹³. However, Marvell’s “tuning of England” shows a striking perversion of the old Pythagorean notion of musical/harmonious universe. Amphion’s extraordinary charisma is replaced with an act of power. The fitting proportion of the two conflicting parties¹⁴ is tuned with a political act of issuing the “Instrument of Government” (December 1653), music is thus “established” politically:

Thus, ere he ceased, his sacred lute creates
 Th’ harmonious city of the seven gates.
 Such was that wondrous order and consent,
 When Cromwell tuned the ruling Instrument. (l. 65-68)

[...]

Then our Amphion issues out and sings,
 And once he struck, and twice, the powerful strings. (l. 74-75)

The proportion of the centre and the sphere – indeed, a central element in the Pythagorean cosmology and in the poetics of correspondences (based on the correspondence between the macrocosm and the microcosm) – is turned upside down: Cromwell is not only the “tuner” of the “ruling Instrument” (l. 68) and guarantee of the coherence of “the Commonwealth”, he is identified with the macro-structure of the “English cosmos”. Cromwell’s fall in the Hyde Park accident is thus an act of “overthrowing Nature’s self” where “the earth did form the centre tear” and “the sun was fall’n out of the sphere” (cf. l. 204-206).

The use of this cosmological simile is striking: it attempts to legitimise a profoundly problematic political arrangement while using a powerful concept from Antiquity¹⁵. The process of “tuning” England thus necessarily involves the process of “untuning the sky”: Cromwell does not seem to be interested in finding a proportion between the centre and the sphere as in the old Pythagorean concept¹⁶. Their relation is not to be looked for, since harmony is no longer the overwhelming characteristics of the universe¹⁷. The idea of harmony is thus no longer sought in meditation focused on reflecting eternal

archetypes, but in disciplining the reality, or, indeed, in creating alternative, private cosmologies, in which these ancient concepts can be exploited and, indeed, abused in many different ways.

In fact, Marvell re-visits the topic of music and cosmos in his famous “Music’s Empire” where he refers to Jubal from the biblical “prehistory”, “the father of all such as handle the harp and organ” (Gen 4, 21). Marvell identifies him with the act of music: just like Cromwell “tuned the ruling Instrument”, Jubal conjured music out of chaos:

Jubal first made the wilder notes agree;
And Jubal tuned music’s Jubilee;
He called the echoes from their sullen cell,
And built the organ’s city where they dwell. (Stanza 2)

Although the date of the composition is unclear, it bears striking resemblance to the musical conceit found in “The First Anniversary”. Moreover, the last two stanzas of this *laus musicae* may suggest a relation to Cromwell’s “musical” seizing of power⁸:

Then, music, the mosaic of the air,
Did of all these a solemn noise prepare:
With which she gained the empire of the ear,
Including all between the earth and sphere.

Victorious sounds! Yet here your homage do
Unto a gentler conqueror than you:
Who though he flies the music of his praise,
Would with you heaven’s hallelujahs raise. (Stanzas 5 and 6)

Music is thus associated with conquering a certain space and turning it into an empire: it is not a force behind, i.e., the veneration of the amazing harmony of the inaudible music of the spheres. It is not surprising, therefore, that the music of the spheres is not even alluded to in this poem. Using these metaphors performs the reality in a tautological, self-consuming act: harmony and music is associated with Cromwell, because Cromwell ultimately defines what harmony and music mean. Poetry ceases to be a liberating discourse and becomes little more than a propaganda text, where the signified consumes the signifier in the logic of a totalitarian regime.

Conclusion

Marvell's "First Anniversary" is an important work for defining the imagery of Cromwellian dictatorship and its inner dilemmas. As we have seen, Marvell understands the rise of Cromwell as the fulfilment of the hope to establish a godly state in England, Scotland and Ireland, and as the materialisation of the aspiration of the earlier Commonwealth (1649-1653). The imagery of a new aeon, a new deal of freedom and a new concept of harmony revisit a number of earlier images – biblical and Classical – in an effort to point out the exceptional nature of the Protectorate, which, however, also justifies a number of "exceptional" measures that supposedly need to be taken to secure the fate of "freedom" in this new era. The deeply paradoxical structure of Cromwellian "no-kingship" (the supposedly "civil", "sober" and non-hereditary nature of the regime versus the logic of its successful continuation) uncovers a major insecurity at the heart of the system, as well as the circular logic of its justification.

In the poem, Cromwell represents both the guarantee of the "objectively acquired" privileges of the English, Scottish and Welsh (as opposed to the past and to the supposedly monstrous regimes of hereditary princes in other European countries), as well as their only "subjective" embodiment. Cromwell can, therefore, establish the harmonious proportion of the system, since he is the author of it. He can decide on the extent of freedom in it (since he saved it from the chaos of various anarchists as well as from the imminent Catholic "monster") and loyalty to him (or, paradoxically, to his dynastic successor Richard) is an automatic prerequisite of any success for the future. The nature of these statements and images uncovers an almost tautological totality of meaning.

Nevertheless, Marvell's fascination with Cromwell can neither be reduced only to the prospect of his future promotion, nor to the obvious fact that the imagery of "The First Anniversary" must have been approved by Cromwellian administration. Indeed, Cromwell's "apocalyptic revelation" provided a "solution" to a deeply divided country and materialised some of the Puritan visions about the providential mission of their revolution. In that sense, it also stimulated a powerful poetic response to it (e.g., the work of Edmund Waller, George Wither, John Lineall). Cromwell's life and death were praised not only by Nedham, Marvell and Milton, but – quite surprisingly – also by a Catholic-to-be, John Dryden⁹. In fact, Marvell's later loyalty to Richard Cromwell lacks the contention he showed for his undoubtedly charismatic

father. Richard's incapacity ultimately made him join the court party and advocate against parliamentary sovereignty (cf. Worden 153).

Marvell, however, was not only a politician, he was also an exceptionally gifted poet. In that sense, the dilemmas of this "double existence" make his Cromwellian poems still a relevant read for the reflection on the relations between the liberty of the artist and the expedient logic of a politician, as well as on the power of images to convey either a new space of freedom or to claim the space for un-musical, political stratagems of any kind.

Notes

1. First published in 1637 in *Musa Cantabrigiensis*.
2. "Any analysis of the 'The First Anniversary' must begin with the title. During the Commonwealth, anniversaries were marked from the regicide [...] The new start date suggests that, since Cromwell had been in office for an entire year, enough time had passed to evaluate the effectiveness of his rule" (Woodford 101).
3. All of the quotations of the "The First Anniversary" as well as other of Marvell's poems are based on the Elizabeth Storry Donno edition of Marvell's poems (Marvell, Andrew. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by Elizabeth Storry Donno. London: Penguin, 1996). In the article, I am referring only to the lines of the poem. (The poem can be found there on pp. 126-137.)
4. Further on this topic see Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1997.
5. Interestingly enough, Cromwell used the argument for readmitting Jews into England the following year, 1656.
6. Elizabeth Storry Donno points out that "Noah's eight" refers to the number of the Lord Protector's closest family (Cromwell, his wife, two sons and four daughters). "Original", biblical Noah's eight "included Noah and his wife, his three sons and their wives" (Marvell 272).
7. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* defines The Fifth Monarchists (or Fifth Monarchy Men) as "an extreme Puritan sect that came into prominence in England during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. They were so called from their belief that the time of the fifth monarchy was at hand – that is, the monarchy that (according to a traditional interpretation of parts of the Bible) should succeed the Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Roman monarchies and during which Christ should reign on earth with his saints for 1,000 years. After the fall of the monarchy, they at first supported Oliver Cromwell. The Nominated, or Barebones, Parliament of 1653, chosen from nominees of the Independent churches, raised their hopes of speedily accomplishing the rule of the saints. The establishment of the Protectorate, however, dashed these hopes and turned the sect against Cromwell."
8. In this context, it should be noted that Cromwell was offered the Crown in February 1657 (in a remonstrance presented by Sir Christopher Packe, now known as "The Humble Petition and Advice"). Cromwell declined the offer on 8 May 1657. "Hence the supreme paradox. Cromwell the king-killer, the reluctant head of state, the visionary, was begged

by his second Parliament to become King Oliver. He was offered the Crown. Ironically, he was offered it to limit his power, to bind him with precedence and with the rule of law. Because such restrictions were irrelevant to the task he believed he was entrusted to perform, because God's Providence did not direct him to restore the office that He had set aside, he declined the throne" (Morrill 328-329).

9. See l. 305-322 of the poem:

And Richard yet where his great parent led
 Beats on the rugged track: He, virtue dead,
 Revives, and by his milder beams assures;
 And yet how much of them his grief obscures?
 He as his rather long was kept from sight
 In private to be viewed by better light:
 But opened once, what splendour does he throw?
 A Cromwell in an hour a prince will grow.
 How he becomes that seat, how strongly strains
 How gently winds at once the ruling reins?
 Heaven to this choice prepared a diadem
 Richer then any Eastern silk or gem:
 A pearly rainbow; where the sun enchased
 His brows, like an imperial jewel graced.
 We find already what those omens mean.
 Earth ne'er more glad, nor heaven more serene:
 Cease now our griefs, calm peace succeeds a war,
 Rainbows to storms, Richard to Oliver. (Marvell 156-157)

10. In the following analysis, I am drawing on my earlier discussion of this topic in my monograph *Concepts of Harmony in Five Metaphysical Poets*. Cf. Jajtner (194-197).
11. For further discussion of this topic see my monograph *Concepts of Harmony in Five Metaphysical Poets*, esp. pp. 26-37.
12. The classical exposition of this myth can be found in Book X and XI of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.
13. In the Neoplatonic context of the Renaissance, music – following the Pythagorean concept – acquired a privileged position in the order of existence, because it reminds the soul of the eternal archetypes of things and thus helps harmonise and sooth the difficulties of everyday life. We may find a good exposition of this theme in Marsilio Ficino's *Book of Life*: "The Pythagoreans used to do wonderful things in the manner of Pheobus and Orpheus with words, songs and sounds. The ancient doctors of the Hebrews considered this most important, and all poets sing and make wonderful things with their songs." For further discussion of the topic see Berley (49).
14. In fact, the Greek word for harmony, *αρμονια*, is derived from *αρμοζειν* which means "fitting together" or "joining" and used as a carpentry term.
15. Cf. my analysis in Jajtner (195).
16. Cf. Hollander's analysis in his major thesis *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry 1500-1700* (303).
17. Perhaps the best exposition of this theme can be found in Sir John Davies's "Orchestra, or a Poem of Dancing" (1596): in this poem, dancing becomes a universal metaphor for the joy of the universe driven by love, where "sweet Musick, Dauncings only life" reminds everyone of the eternal harmony of the cosmos. Cf. stanza 95 of the poem:

So Musick to her owne sweet tunes doth trip
VVith tricks of, 3, 5, 8, 15, and more:
So doth the Art of Numbring seeme to skip
From eu'n to odd in her proportion'd score:
So doe those skills whose quick eyes doe explore
The iust dimension both of earth and heau'n
In all their rules obserue a measure eu'n.

18. The poem was first published in the Folio edition of 1681 and the resemblances and possible allusions to the “The First Anniversary” has led some critics to suppose that the poem belongs among those related to the Cromwellian period. For further discussion of this topic, cf. E. Storry Donne’s reference in her notes to her edition of Marvell’s poems (263).
19. I am referring to his poem “Heroic Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell” (publ. 1658), arguably his first important poetic work.

Works Cited

- Berley, Mark. *After the Heavenly Tune: English Poetry and the Aspiration to Song*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2000. Print.
- Davies, John. “Orchestra: or, a Poem of Dancing.” *Renascance Editions*. University of Oregon. Transcribed by Risa S. Bear, 2001. Web. 20 February 2015.
- “Fifth Monarchy Men”. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Web. 20 February 2015.
- Hollander, John. *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry 1500-1700*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. Print.
- Jajtner, Tomáš. *Concepts of Harmony in Five Metaphysical Poets*. Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart, 2012. Print.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1997.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by Elizabeth Storry Donno. London: Penguin, 1996. Print.
- McGlammery, Gayla S. “The Rhetoric of Apocalypse and Practical Politics in Marvell’s ‘First Anniversary of the Government under O.C.’” *South Atlantic Review* 55 (November 1990): 19-35. Print.
- Morrill, John. “The Stuarts (1603-1688).” *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*. Edited by Kenneth O. Morgan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.
- Tripp, Edward. *Crowell’s Handbook of Classical Mythology*. New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1970. Print.
- Woodford, Benjamin. *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell’s Power*. McGill-Queen’s Press, 2013. Print.

Worden, Blair. *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

TOMÁŠ JAJTNER is Assistant Professor of English literature at the English Department at the Faculty of Arts, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice. He completed his Ph.D. in 2006 at Charles University, Prague (dissertation *Concepts of Harmony in Five Metaphysical Poets*, publ. 2012). In 2013 he received his second doctorate in theology from the Faculty of Catholic Theology also at Charles University, Prague. He was Assistant Professor at New York University, Prague and at Metropolitan University, Prague. He has published several articles on English and Czech literature. His research interests include early modern English literature (drama and poetry), modern British conservatism and relations between literature and religion and literature and theology.

tjajtner@ff:jcu.cz